

Exhibit DD

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:

**MITSUBISHI TANABE PHARMA
CORPORATION, et al.**

17-5005

5 | Plaintiffs,

**ORAL OPINION DECIDING
PLAINTIFFS' MARCH 20, 2020
LETTER APPLICATION (DKT.
NO. 278) SEEKING TO STRIKE
PORTIONS OF DEFENDANTS'
EXPERT REPORTS**

6 v.

7 AUROBINDO PHARMA USA, INC.,
et al.,

Defendants.

10 Thursday, May 14, 2020
 Commencing at 3:45 p.m.

BEFORE: THE HONORABLE JOEL SCHNEIDER,
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

13 | APPARENCES:

14 SAUL EWING ARNSTEIN & LEHR LLP
BY: WILLIAM C. BATON, ESQUIRE
15 One Riverfront Plaza, Suite 1520
Newark, NJ 07102-5426
16 For the Plaintiff

17 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
18 BY: COLLEEN TRACY JAMES, ESQUIRE
RAYMOND N. NIMROD, ESQUIRE
CATHERINE T. MATTES, ESQUIRE
19 BRIAN FORSATZ, ESQUIRE
20 51 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10010
For the Plaintiff

22 Karen Friedlander, Official Court Reporter
friedlanderreporter@gmail.com
23 (856) 756-0160

24 Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography;
transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

1 **A P P E A R A N C E S : - C O N T I N U E D**

2 RAKOCZY MOLINO MAZZOCHI SIWIK
3 BY: DEANNE MAZZOCHI, ESQUIRE
6 West Hubbard Street
Suite 500
4 Chicago, Illinois 60654
For the Defendant Lupin

5 CARELLA BYRNE CECCHI OLSTEIN BRODY & AGNELLO, P.C.
6 BY: MELISSA E. FLAX, ESQUIRE
5 Becker Farm Road
7 Roseland, NJ 07068
For the Defendant Lupin

8 HILL WALLACK LLP
9 BY: ERIC I ABRAHAM, ESQUIRE
21 Roszel Road
10 Princeton, NJ 08540
For the Defendant Sandoz

11 BRINKS GILSON & LIONE
12 BY: MARK H. REMUS, ESQUIRE
JOSHUA H. JAMES, ESQUIRE
13 455 N. Cityfront Plaza Drive
Chicago, IL 60611
14 For the Defendant Sandoz

15 COSNER YOUNGELSON
16 BY: REBECCA HAND, ESQUIRE
MARC D. YOUNGELSON, ESQUIRE
17 197 Route 18, Suite 104
East Brunswick, NJ 08816
For the Defendant Aurobindo

18 WITHERS BERGMAN LLP
19 BY: STEVEN J. MOORE, ESQUIRE
JAMES NEILON, ESQUIRE
20 1700 East Putnam Avenue
Greenwich, CT 06830
21 For the Defendant Aurobindo

22 SAIBER LLC
23 BY: KATHERINE ESCANLAR, ESQUIRE
18 Columbia Turnpike, Suite 200
Florham Park, NJ 07932
24 For the Defendant Zydus

25

1 **A P P E A R A N C E S : - C O N T I N U E D**

2 KASOWITZ BENSON TORRES LLP
3 BY: TREVOR WELCH, ESQUIRE
HERSHY STERN, ESQUIRE
1399 New York Ave NW, Suite 201
4 Washington, DC 20005
For the Defendant, Zydus

5 FLASTER GREENBERG, PC
6 BY: JEFFREY A. COHEN, ESQUIRE
Commerce Center
7 1810 Chapel Avenue West
Cherry Hill, NJ 08002
8 For the Defendant, Laurus Labs Ltd.

9 STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX
10 BY: JOSEPH KIM, ESQUIRE
1100 New York Avenue N.W.
Washington, DC 20005
11 For the Defendant, Laurus Labs Ltd.

12 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
13 BY: JOVIAL WONG, ESQUIRE
SHARON LIN, ESQUIRE
14 1901 L Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
15 For the Defendant, MSN

16 MIDLIGE RICHTER LLC
17 BY: JAMES S. RICHTER, ESQUIRE
645 Martinsville Road
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920
18 For the Defendant, MSN

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 (ALL PARTIES VIA TELEPHONE, May 14, 2020, 3:42 p.m.)

2 THE COURT: Hi, counsel. Judge Schneider here. Is
3 Karen there?

4 THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, Judge.

5 THE COURT: I'm ready to put the opinion of the Court
6 on the record regarding plaintiffs' discovery application, to
7 be confirmed in a written order to be entered. So bear with
8 me, counsel, while I read the opinion. This matter is before
9 the Court on plaintiffs' March 20, 2020 application, Docket
10 No. 278 to strike portions of defendants' expert reports.

11 The application is directed to all defendants except
12 Sandoz. Therefore, to the extent the Court's ruling strikes
13 any portion of defendants' expert reports, the ruling does not
14 apply to Sandoz.

15 The Court has received extensive briefs and held oral
16 argument on April 14 and May 14, 2020. This oral opinion is
17 being read into the record after the completion of oral
18 argument on May 14, 2020. Plaintiffs' application addresses
19 various aspects of the affirmative expert reports prepared by
20 Doctors Eckhardt and Cockcroft that were served on February 7,
21 2020.

22 At bottom, plaintiffs move to strike portions of the
23 noted expert reports because plaintiffs claim the experts
24 improperly attempted to amend defendants' invalidity
25 contentions that were served on March 30, 2018, and the

1 amendment violates Local Patent Rule 3.7 which requires an
2 amendment may only be made pursuant to a court order.

3 At oral argument on April 14 the parties agreed that
4 plaintiffs' arguments are divided into three general areas;
5 one, plaintiffs addressed defendants' Section 112 invalidity
6 argument; two, plaintiffs addressed defendants' obviousness
7 argument; and three, plaintiffs addressed defendants'
8 anticipation argument.

9 Before the Court discusses the applicable law and its
10 rulings, some general background information will be set
11 forth. Obviously the parties know this ANDA patent litigation
12 involves plaintiffs' '582 and '202 patents. The parties also
13 obviously know the Local Patent Rules set forth the required
14 timing and content of the parties' contentions.

15 On March 30, 2018, defendants filed their 113-page
16 joint invalidity contentions. Plaintiffs responded on
17 June 29, 2018. Sandoz's contentions were also filed on
18 March 30, 2018, which Sandoz supplemented on September 19,
19 2018. And on November 12, 2018, plaintiffs responded to
20 Sandoz's supplemental contentions. Defendants' expert reports
21 at issue were served on February 7, 2020. Plaintiffs'
22 application seeking to strike portions of the noted expert
23 reports, Docket No. 278, was filed on March 20, 2020. At
24 present, the final pretrial conference in the case is
25 scheduled on June 1, 2020, and trial is presently scheduled on

1 June 22nd, 2020. As to the applicable law, the general
2 principles the Court has to apply should not be in dispute.
3 Local Patent Rule 3.3 addresses the required timing and
4 content of infringement contention. Local Patent Rule 3.4
5 addresses the documents that must be produced with invalidity
6 contentions. Amendments to contentions are governed by Local
7 Patent Rule 3.7. The rule not only applies to amendments to
8 contentions, but also disclosures for other documents required
9 to be filed or exchanged.

10 Unlike Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15 where
11 amendments are freely given when justice so requires,
12 amendments under Patent Rule 3.7 are more stringent and may
13 only be granted upon a showing of good cause.

14 This is true in part because the philosophy behind
15 amending claim charts is conservative and is designed to
16 prevent the shifting sands approach for a party's contentions.

17 It is clear, therefore, that a party may not amend
18 its contentions and produce documents and/or identify
19 documents that must otherwise be produced and/or identified
20 pursuant to Local Patent Rule 3.4 via an expert report.

21 It is also clear that if an expert report
22 impermissibly attempts to amend a party's contentions, the
23 relevant portions of the expert report must be stricken. See
24 *Merck, Sharp & Dohme versus Sandoz*, 2014 Westlaw, 1494592 at
25 411-12, District of New Jersey, April 16, 2014.

1 As noted in this case, a party cannot circumvent the
2 local rules by including in expert reports what should have
3 been included in a parties' contentions.

4 As a result, the court must endeavor to determine if
5 defendants' expert reports are impermissibly attempting to
6 amend defendants' contentions or if, as defendants assert,
7 one, the contents of defendants' experts reports that
8 plaintiff object to were, in fact, contained in defendants'
9 contentions or if, two, defendants are not, in fact, amending
10 their contentions but simply citing to evidence supporting
11 their defenses.

12 The ruling on the issues in dispute the Court must
13 take into account the purpose and requirements of contentions.
14 The process has been addressed by this Court in many opinions
15 and its previous discussions are applicable and incorporated
16 herein by reference.

17 Although the Court has many opinions to choose from,
18 for present purposes, it will primarily rely on its opinions
19 and decisions in *Eagleview Technologies versus Xactware*
20 *Solutions*, 2017 Westlaw, 5886004, District of New Jersey,
21 November 29, 2017, and *Horizon Pharma AG v. Watson*
22 *Laboratories*, 2015 Westlaw, 12850575, District of New Jersey,
23 February 24th, 2015.

24 As noted, the Court's discussion in these two cases
25 is incorporated and adopted herein by reference.

1 At set forth by the Court in its opinions, the local
2 rules require parties to establish their contentions early on.
3 The rules require full and timely disclosure that provides all
4 parties with adequate notice and information with which to
5 litigate their cases.

6 This is true in order that parties crystallize their
7 theories of the case early on in the litigation and adhere to
8 these theories once they have been disclosed.

9 As the Court noted in *Eagleview*, there should be no
10 dispute that the local rules require parties to serve fulsome
11 and timely contentions as early as possible in the litigation.

12 With this background, the Court will proceed to
13 analyze plaintiffs' arguments and, as will be discussed,
14 plaintiffs' application is granted in part and denied in part.

15 The Court will next address plaintiffs' Section 112
16 invalidity argument.

17 Plaintiffs argue there are three different
18 subsections of this argument; one, written description; two
19 enablement; and three, indefiniteness. As to written
20 description, plaintiffs agree defendants disclosed Claim 1 of
21 the '582 Patent did not satisfy the written description
22 requirement, but defendants' contentions were silent with
23 respect to Claims 3 and 4. Claim 1 is no longer being
24 asserted in plaintiffs' case in chief.

25 Defendants acknowledge they did not specifically or

1 explicitly set forth that Claims 3 and 4 were invalid because
2 of their written description, but that this was nevertheless
3 included in their contentions. Defendants argue since Claims
4 3 and 4 are dependent on Claim 1, all of the arguments as to
5 Claim 1 apply to Claims 3 and 4.

6 Defendants also argue by using the term "asserted
7 claims" on Page 46 of their contentions and defining it as
8 they did, that the asserted claims included Claims 3 and 4 of
9 the '582 patent.

10 Defendants also argue they incorporated by reference
11 Section 2(B) (2) at the top of Page 54 of their contentions,
12 which refers to Claim 3 as well as several other relevant
13 incorporations.

14 The Court agrees with plaintiffs that defendants did
15 not sufficiently include in their contentions that they would
16 assert a description invalidity defense as to Claims 3 and 4
17 of the '582 patent. The Court, therefore, strikes these
18 portions of the Cockcroft expert report or the Eckhardt expert
19 report that addresses this invalidity defense.

20 First, it is apparent that this defense was not
21 explicitly set forth as it should have been. Second,
22 plaintiffs should not have to go through what the Court calls
23 "hoops and loops" and inferences to identify defendants'
24 defenses. This is what would be required if the Court adopts
25 defendants' argument.

1 The Court agrees with plaintiffs that defendants' 2 general definitions and boilerplate incorporation by reference 3 statements in their 113-page invalidity contentions did not 4 appropriately notify them of the written description defense 5 as to Claims 3 and 4. This includes defendants' boilerplate 6 incorporation of Sandoz's invalidity contentions. This type 7 of general boilerplate incorporation is not in accord with the 8 letter and spirit required in New Jersey's Local Patent Rules 9 requiring full, complete, fulsome, and unambiguous 10 disclosures.

11 Third, if defendants intended when they served their 12 contentions, to assert a written description defense to Claims 13 3 and 4, they would not have worded the heading in their 14 contentions "Claim 1 of the '582 Patent is indefinite." See 15 Page 46 of defendants' contentions. Instead, defendants would 16 have and should have specifically referred to Claims 1, 3, and 17 4.

18 Further, it is relatively easy to see how plaintiffs 19 were misled since under the heading "Invalidity of Claims 3 20 and 4" no Section 112 defense was specifically asserted.

21 Accordingly, the relevant portions of defendants' 22 expert reports referring to a written description invalidity 23 defense as to Claims 3 and 4 are stricken.

24 The Court now turns to enablement. The plaintiffs 25 acknowledge this argument is nuanced. Plaintiffs admit

1 defendants' joint contentions stated a person of ordinary
2 skill in the art could not make all the forms of canagliflozin
3 hemihydrate that were claimed. However, plaintiffs argue
4 Cockcroft's report now says a person of ordinary skill can't
5 make any canagliflozin hemihydrate.

6 Defendant argues Cockcroft is simply providing
7 evidence of why a person of ordinary skill can't make any
8 hemihydrate. Defendants argue they are not changing their
9 contentions because they are simply showing, in their words,
10 plaintiff has not enabled the full scope. See transcript of
11 oral argument on April 14 at Page 27, Line 5.

12 On this issue the Court rules in plaintiffs' favor.
13 Defendants are limited to what they claim in their
14 contentions. To the extent Cockcroft purports to testify that
15 any of the subject product can't be made, the testimony is
16 barred. However, Cockcroft can testify to what is in
17 defendants' contentions, i.e. that not all of the product is
18 enabled.

19 The Court will briefly comment on defendants'
20 argument directed to plaintiffs' discovery responses. To the
21 extent defendants attempt to excuse or justify their new
22 contentions because of plaintiffs' alleged failure to produce
23 discovery, the argument is rejected. It is simply too late in
24 the case to raise a discovery issue now. Defendants have not
25 been shy about raising disputes and they could have and should

1 have raised any discovery disputes earlier.

2 The third area to address is indefiniteness.

3 Plaintiffs argue nowhere in defendants' contentions do they
4 claim the term "hemihydrate" is indefinite. Plaintiffs argue
5 defendants knew what plaintiffs' construction of the term was
6 and they never moved to amend their contentions.

7 Defendants argue since their contentions stated the
8 phrase "crystallize form" was indefinite, the term applies to
9 hemihydrate. The Court finds in plaintiffs' favor and strikes
10 the relevant indefinite paragraph from defendants' expert
11 reports.

12 Defendants essentially admit this defense was not
13 disclosed in their contentions. Defendants admitted at oral
14 argument that this indefinite argument only accrued after the
15 *Markman* construction. See transcript, Page 36, Line 12 to 14.
16 Therefore, the defense could not have been disclosed with
17 defendants' contentions served on March 30, 2018, which was
18 long before the *Markman* ruling. Defendants could have moved
19 to amend their contentions after the *Markman* ruling. It's too
20 late to do it now.

21 The Court now turns to the second general area in
22 dispute, which is defendants' anticipation defense addressed
23 in Eckhardt's report.

24 Simply stated, plaintiffs argue there is no
25 discussion of an anticipation argument that relies on hydrate

1 references in Janssen's internal documents. Therefore,
2 plaintiffs seek to strike these references.

3 In response, defendants argue the references in
4 question are not prior art but instead are extrinsic evidence
5 that concerns their contentions. Defendants argue Eckhardt is
6 not asserting a new theory but instead he is citing to
7 evidence to support a theory set forth in defendants'
8 contentions.

9 Defendants argue the Local Patent Rules do not
10 require parties to submit every piece of evidence. See
11 transcript at Page 43, Line 6. As to this argument the Court
12 rules in defendants' favor. In *Monsanto versus Dupont*, 878
13 F.3d 1336, Page 1335, Fed. Circuit 2018, a case not directly
14 on point but instructive, the Court ruled the cited references
15 were extrinsic evidence that was offered to explain and
16 support the proffered prior art. As noted in *Monsanto*,
17 extrinsic evidence may be used to interpret the allegedly
18 anticipatory reference and to shed light on what it would have
19 meant to a person of ordinary skill in the art. See also in
20 re *Baxter Travenol Labs*, 952 F.2d. 388, Page 390, Fed. Circuit
21 1991, which stated that extrinsic evidence may be considered
22 when it is used to explain but not expand the meaning of the
23 reference.

24 Since the Court finds the cited references are
25 extrinsic evidence rather than prior art, plaintiffs'

1 application regarding defendants' anticipation defense is
2 denied. This oral opinion makes it clear that the cited
3 references may not be used as classic prior art.

4 The Court now turns to the obviousness issue. This
5 issue is divided into three subsections; one, references and
6 combinations not disclosed; two, previously disclosed
7 references cited for a different purpose; three, additions of
8 the knowledge of a person of ordinary skill in the art to the
9 combination. As to subsection 1, references and combinations
10 not disclosed, plaintiffs' March 24, 2020 letter brief at Page
11 6, Docket No. 290, highlights what is at issue.

12 Plaintiffs claim these are new references and
13 combinations. Defendants argue these were all disclosed and
14 what plaintiffs are really objecting to is Eckhardt addressing
15 the substance of plaintiffs' validity contentions. The Court
16 agrees with defendants, with two provisos. If we lived in a
17 perfect world, defendants would have put their contentions in
18 a perfect chart form; however, for present purposes, the Court
19 finds that defendants made a sufficient disclosure to put
20 plaintiffs on notice of the references and combinations at
21 issue.

22 The two provisos to the Court's ruling are as
23 follows: One, as to the Etter and Jeffrey references, they
24 were not previously disclosed prior art, therefore, they are
25 stricken from defendants' expert reports.

1 Further, combination No. 9, which was not previously
2 disclosed shall be stricken.

3 The second subsection to deal with is previously
4 disclosed prior art used for a new purpose.

5 This argument does not merit much discussion. The
6 Court finds that under the circumstances of this case, the
7 plaintiffs are attempting to create too fine a line. As to
8 this case, defendants are permitted to respond to plaintiffs'
9 contentions by referring to all cited portions of the
10 references in defendants' expert reports already cited in
11 defendants' invalidity contentions.

12 The third and last subsection to address is the
13 addition of the knowledge of a POSA to a combination.

14 Plaintiffs argue Eckhardt has added this to his combinations
15 and this gives defendants a back door to include an infinite
16 number of references. Again, defendants argue that it's just
17 background and was disclosed.

18 The Court agrees with defendants, especially since
19 plaintiffs' contentions apparently make the same references.

20 It will be made clear, however, that when the POSA
21 refers to references, he or she is limited to references that
22 have previously been disclosed in the case.

23 In sum, therefore, the Court's rulings can be
24 summarized as follows, and will be set forth in an order to be
25 entered: One, the portions of defendants' expert reports that

1 refer to the Section 112 invalidity defense as applicable to
2 Claims 3 and 4 of the '582 patent are stricken.

3 Two, the portions of defendants' experts reports
4 regarding an enablement defense that a person of ordinary
5 skill in the art cannot make "any" forms of canagliflozin
6 hemihydrate are stricken. Defendants experts may address
7 whether a POSA can make "all" forms of this product.

8 Three, portions of defendants' expert reports
9 asserting an indefinite defense based on the construction of
10 hemihydrate are stricken.

11 Four, plaintiffs' request to strike "hydrate"
12 references and Janssen's internal documents in the context of
13 defendants' anticipation defense is denied.

14 Five, as to plaintiffs' request to strike portions of
15 defendants' expert reports addressing the obviousness defense,
16 one, plaintiffs' request to strike alleged new references and
17 combinations not previously disclosed is denied, except the
18 references to Etter and Jeffrey and combination 9 are
19 stricken.

20 Two, plaintiffs' request to strike portions of
21 references previously disclosed that were allegedly cited for
22 a different purpose is denied.

23 And three, plaintiffs' request to strike the addition
24 of a POSA to a combination is denied, except when the POSA
25 evidence relies on references, the evidence may only rely on

1 references disclosed in defendants' contentions.

2 It will be further ordered that portions of
3 plaintiffs' expert reports that solely rebut the stricken
4 portions of defendants' expert reports are stricken. And
5 last, it will be ordered that this order does not address the
6 expert submissions of Sandoz.

7 So, counsel, that's the Court's oral opinion and
8 ruling, to be confirmed in an order to be entered. There was
9 one other issue I wanted to address with you, and that has to
10 do with the timing in the case. Obviously, because of the
11 current crisis, we face a different world than we did when the
12 trial date was set. Whether the trial will take place in June
13 as ordered is one hundred percent in the control of Judge
14 Bumb.

15 But a question I had was whether some sort of
16 application is going to be made to Judge Bumb in light of the
17 postponement of what's been referenced as a related patent
18 case before Judge Wolfson.

19 Can anyone speak to that?

20 MR. BATON: Your Honor, this is Bill Baton for
21 plaintiffs. We understand Your Honor had inquired about this
22 because of the compound case before Chief Judge Wolfson. That
23 trial will not -- obviously did not proceed in May as it had
24 been scheduled, and as Your Honor correctly noted, there was
25 an order entered in that case by Chief Judge Wolfson that

1 essentially, you know, prevents Zydis, I believe, from going
2 on the market, but they could probably, if they're on the
3 call, could make it more clear, about four months after the
4 close of evidence at that trial. That trial has not been
5 rescheduled yet.

6 The parties had been discussing the COVID-19
7 situation, the compound case and its effect on this
8 potentially, and my understanding is there's somewhat of
9 unanimous thought that it's unworkable under the circumstances
10 the way the parties have been hampered on expert discovery to
11 try the case in June in light of COVID-19, and in light of the
12 agreement and order in the compound case, the parties have
13 been conferring about what they could agree upon as a schedule
14 to be proposed or to Judge Bumb about the trial in this case
15 and the completion of discovery in time for a trial such that
16 I understand that it would not, you know, go beyond what is
17 contemplated in the compound case.

18 But those discussions are ongoing, as far as I
19 understand, and we are intending to come to some kind of
20 consensus and present that to Judge Bumb, in which we would of
21 course include Your Honor in that submission, so you're aware
22 of it. If you'd like us to work with you, we're happy to do
23 that, but I don't think there's anything ripe to present to
24 this Court at this time today. But we are working on it.
25 That's the status update.

1 THE COURT: Well, you can copy me on the
2 correspondence to Judge Bumb, but you ought to direct it to
3 her because she's solely in control of the scheduling. I
4 suppose what I'm thinking of is -- listen, the final pretrial
5 conference is scheduled for June 1. It's doubtful if it goes
6 off it will be in person, so it will be by phone probably, but
7 I know how much work is involved in that. But right now the
8 trial date is set, so it's not appropriate for me to change
9 the date for the preparation and submission of the final
10 pretrial order. But if it turns out that Judge Bumb moves the
11 trial date and if the parties agree I can be flexible and we
12 can be flexible in terms of adjusting the dates of the
13 preparation of the final pretrial order. That's up to you.
14 If you want to go ahead and prepare it, that's perfectly fine,
15 I have no problem with that. But if the trial is going to be
16 pushed off to some date, I don't know when in the future, I
17 certainly have no burning desire to force the parties to get
18 the order done so we can have a final pretrial conference by
19 June 1.

20 I think you understand what I'm saying, that we can
21 be flexible with regard to the order, as long as the trial
22 date is moved. But until that trial date is changed, you
23 know, we'll keep the deadlines for the final pretrial order
24 on.

25 MR. BATON: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. This is Bill

1 Baton again. We will, you know, make a submission to Judge
2 Bumb when the parties have something to propose, you know, and
3 there is, as I said, you know, ongoing discussions about that,
4 and we are cognizant of the pretrial order deadline, et
5 cetera. And so we are, I think, endeavoring to get out in
6 front of that obviously so that it gives the Court time to
7 consider any potential application.

8 And we will copy you, but direct it to Judge Bumb.

9 THE COURT: Does that case, Judge Wolfson's case,
10 necessarily have to try before this case and be decided?

11 MR. BATON: Your Honor, once again, Bill Baton. I
12 think one of the issues and why we consider it related, first
13 of all, it's the same ANDAs with the defendants and only one
14 defendant in this case, likewise in the compound case before
15 Chief Judge Wolfson, could enter the market absent a decision
16 from a court before 2025, based on the regulatory filings.

17 So wrapping up what's going to happen in the compound
18 case, there's always been something the plaintiffs at least --
19 I can only speak for the plaintiffs -- believe makes sense
20 because of the ramifications on the other defendants who
21 otherwise aren't going to the market anyway unless there's
22 some, you know, ruling.

23 And so in light of those, I guess complexities, it's
24 plaintiffs' position that, you know -- well, first of all,
25 let's put it this way, and I don't mean to backtrack, but for

1 the agreement that Zydus has made and the order that was put
2 in place about its agreement not to launch four months after
3 the close of evidence in the compound case trial, that does in
4 some way affect in case, because even if there were -- and we
5 don't have such an agreement at this time in this case, but if
6 we were, we would obviously present that to the Court.

7 But if we do not have that agreement, I still would
8 think -- I still think their agreement in the compound case is
9 applicable because they're not going to be able to launch in
10 this case unless there's a decision, and they'd still have to
11 wait until the close of evidence in four months or a decision
12 in the compound case.

13 So they are tied together in that regardless of
14 whether there is agreement in this case, they've made an
15 agreement not to launch and, you know, it's the same product
16 essentially, just different patents.

17 So there are things we are trying to work out with
18 the defendants, but that's sort of where it lines up and that
19 they are connected and we need to, you know, come to a
20 consensus about what we want to present to Judge Bumb and we
21 will do that.

22 MR. WELCH: Your Honor, can I be heard? This is
23 Trevor Welch on behalf Zydus. May I be heard?

24 THE COURT: Sure.

25 MR. WELCH: Okay. There's absolutely no reason why

1 these two cases can't be sequenced one before the other. They
2 are related, they're relating to the same product, ultimately,
3 but as plaintiffs pointed out, Zydus has the most pressing
4 interest on getting this product to market sooner. We want to
5 get this case done as soon as possible, and so in our view,
6 there's no reason why delaying the other case should impact
7 this case at all. If we can get this done soon, we'd love to
8 do it.

9 MR. BATON: Your Honor, this is Bill Baton. I'd like
10 to respond to that because during the course of the
11 discussions as late as I believe yesterday, there certainly
12 wasn't any position taken from Zydus that we -- there was an
13 agreement or some need to try the case in June. The proposal
14 I understood was not anywhere near June as the proposed trial
15 date, but even in our discussions with them.

16 So to the extent he's making one point, I don't think
17 we can just assume that the point he's making about when the
18 trial takes place necessarily means he's arguing for a June
19 trial. If he is, that's a departure from what we've heard
20 recently.

21 THE COURT: I guess there's a couple of different
22 issues. One is because of COVID-19 whether it's feasible even
23 if Judge Bumb wants to go ahead to have a trial in June is one
24 issue, and the second issue is whether it's appropriate for
25 this case to be put on ice until Judge Wolfson's case is tried

1 and decided, I think are two different issues. Judge Bumb is
2 going to address both of those issues. I do think in
3 fairness, whenever your submissions are made to Judge Bumb,
4 they should be coordinated, because if there's going to be an
5 objection delaying or postponing for any material time the
6 trial, she ought to hear both sides of the issue, and I'm sure
7 she will hear both sides of the issues.

8 So maybe there being objection and all of you will
9 take one position and Zydus will take a different position,
10 but clearly Judge Bumb needs to know that, okay?

11 MR. BATON: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. And just to
12 be clear, I mean the plaintiffs aren't suggesting that the
13 case be put on ice and do nothing until the compound case
14 happens. I think there's a discussion about how to complete
15 this case in a timely manner that makes sense under the
16 COVID-19 era to complete this case and get a trial ready.

17 And, you know, just to the earlier point I made about
18 the compound case, regardless of what Zydus's position might
19 be today, if we -- if the plaintiffs win the compound case,
20 that may obviate the need to have a polymorph trial which is
21 this case, the polymorph patent. So it may obviate the need
22 to have that trial. And I say "may" but it's a possibility.
23 So it's something that we put into the calculus. But we'll
24 say enough about that for now because we're talking schedule
25 and we're going to try to be reasonable here hopefully with

1 the parties and be respectful of Judge Bumb's concerns as
2 well.

3 THE COURT: Does anything need to be done in this
4 case aside from the preparation of the final pretrial order or
5 addressing the issues that we're going to argue I think on
6 Monday?

7 MS. MAZZOCHI: Your Honor, this is Deanne Mazzochi.
8 Sorry, Your Honor, are you still there?

9 THE COURT: Yes.

10 MS. MAZZOCHI: Did we lose the Court?

11 THE COURT: No, I'm here. Can you hear me?

12 MS. MAZZOCHI: Yes, I can hear you. I just wasn't
13 sure if anyone else could hear me. This is Ms. Mazzochi, Your
14 Honor. Certainly on behalf of Lupin, the parties have not
15 taken any expert discovery, one; we have not yet filed our
16 reply expert reports. The parties have agreed to move those
17 dates. And again, we're just trying to -- our thought process
18 was try to present the Court with ideally one final schedule
19 that could be adopted that would work for all parties. We're
20 not quite there yet, but we've made a lot of progress over the
21 course of the last week and we do have to get something to
22 Judge Bumb certainly before the end of the month.

23 One of the issues, you know, because we have overseas
24 experts, you know, trying to arrange for that, and also given
25 the volume of documents that are usually an issue when it

1 comes to these depositions, I think all of the parties want to
2 take the expert depositions live. So I think that there is a
3 huge recognition that the trial date does need to be
4 postponed, we're just trying to get approximate time period.

5 And from Lupin's perspective, because of the nature
6 and the position of our case, there's no need for us to try
7 this case quickly, given it's procedural posture in effect of
8 what happens on the compound case. So I think because there
9 are several defendants where, for procedural reasons, we
10 are -- we do not need to rush. I think that's what, you know,
11 leading to the differences, in terms of, you know, the
12 plaintiffs and most of the defendants underlying assertions to
13 Zydus. And we are trying quite diligently to see if we can
14 work all of that out so that we're presenting this Court with
15 one proposed deadline.

16 THE COURT: You know what would be really nice,
17 counsel, if you settled the case so that this Court doesn't
18 have to deal with these mind-numbing issues.

19 (Laughter)

20 THE COURT: I'll leave that in your very capable
21 hands.

22 MS. MAZZOCHI: Thank you, Your Honor. And again,
23 this is Ms. Mazzochi. I do want to let the Court know that
24 obviously we will be reading the Court's decision today with
25 great care, but I do want to let the Court know that, you

1 know, we obviously expect that plaintiffs will be held to the
2 same standards of disclosure that the defendants are and you
3 may see us as well in connection with any contention
4 disclosure issues. But again, we'll try to meet and confer
5 with the plaintiffs to see if we can work that out without
6 having to trouble the Court.

7 THE COURT: That would be delightful.

8 MS. MAZZOCHI: We will try.

9 THE COURT: Nothing would please me more, and there's
10 only one set of rules that applies in the case and they apply
11 to everybody. So what's good for the goose is good for the
12 gander.

13 I hope everyone is safe. I guess we'll talk on
14 Monday, and if there's nothing else, we're adjourned.

15 MS. MAZZOCHI: Thank you very much.

16 MS. JAMES: Thank you, very much, Your Honor. We
17 greatly appreciate the Court's time.

18 RESPONSE: Thank you, Your Honor.

19 (4:28 p.m.)

20 -

21 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the
22 record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

23 /S/ Karen Friedlander, CRR, RMR
Court Reporter/Transcriber

24

25 May 15, 2020
Date

<p>'</p> <p>202[1] - 5:12 582[6] - 5:12, 8:21, 9:9, 9:17, 10:14, 16:2</p> <p>/</p> <p>/S[1] - 26:23</p> <p>0</p> <p>06830[1] - 2:20 07068[1] - 2:7 07102-5426[1] - 1:15 07920[1] - 3:17 07932[1] - 2:23 08002[1] - 3:7 08540[1] - 2:10 08816[1] - 2:17</p> <p>1</p> <p>1[10] - 5:25, 8:20, 8:23, 9:4, 9:5, 10:14, 10:16, 14:9, 19:5, 19:19 10010[1] - 1:20 104[1] - 2:16 1100[1] - 3:10 112[4] - 5:5, 8:15, 10:20, 16:1 113-page[2] - 5:15, 10:3 12[2] - 5:19, 12:15 12850575[1] - 7:22 1335[1] - 13:13 1336[1] - 13:13 1399[1] - 3:3 14[8] - 1:10, 4:1, 4:16, 4:18, 5:3, 11:11, 12:15 1494592[1] - 6:24 15[2] - 6:10, 26:25 1520[1] - 1:15 16[1] - 6:25 17-5005[1] - 1:4 1700[1] - 2:20 18[2] - 2:16, 2:23 1810[1] - 3:7 19[1] - 5:18 1901[1] - 3:13 197[1] - 2:16 1991[1] - 13:21</p> <p>2</p> <p>2(B)(2[1] - 9:11 20[3] - 1:5, 4:9, 5:23</p>	<p>200[1] - 2:23 20005[2] - 3:4, 3:10 20036[1] - 3:14 201[1] - 3:3 2014[2] - 6:24, 6:25 2015[2] - 7:22, 7:23 2017[2] - 7:20, 7:21 2018[8] - 4:25, 5:15, 5:17, 5:18, 5:19, 12:17, 13:13 2020[13] - 1:5, 1:10, 4:1, 4:9, 4:16, 4:18, 4:21, 5:21, 5:23, 5:25, 6:1, 14:10, 26:25 2025[1] - 20:16 21[1] - 2:9 22nd[1] - 6:1 24[1] - 14:10 24th[1] - 7:23 27[1] - 11:11 278[3] - 1:6, 4:10, 5:23 29[2] - 5:17, 7:21 290[1] - 14:11</p> <p>3</p> <p>3[13] - 8:23, 9:1, 9:4, 9:5, 10:5, 10:13, 10:16, 10:19, 10:23, 16:2 3.3[1] - 6:3 3.4[2] - 6:4, 6:20 3.7[3] - 5:1, 6:7, 6:12 30[4] - 4:25, 5:15, 5:18, 12:17 36[1] - 12:15 388[1] - 13:20 390[1] - 13:20 3:42[1] - 4:1 3:45[1] - 1:10</p> <p>4</p> <p>4[12] - 8:23, 9:1, 9:4, 9:5, 9:8, 9:12, 9:16, 10:5, 10:13, 10:17, 10:20, 10:23, 16:2 411-12[1] - 6:25 43[1] - 13:11 455[1] - 2:13 46[2] - 9:7, 10:15 4:28[1] - 26:19</p> <p>5</p> <p>5[2] - 2:6, 11:11 500[1] - 2:3 51[1] - 1:19</p>	<p>54[1] - 9:11 5886004[1] - 7:20</p> <p>6</p> <p>6[3] - 2:3, 13:11, 14:11 60611[1] - 2:13 60654[1] - 2:4 645[1] - 3:16</p> <p>7</p> <p>7[2] - 4:20, 5:21 756-0160[1] - 1:23</p> <p>8</p> <p>856[1] - 1:23 878[1] - 13:12</p> <p>9</p> <p>9[2] - 15:1, 16:18 952[1] - 13:20</p> <p>A</p> <p>able[1] - 21:9 above-entitled[1] - 26:22 ABRAHAM[1] - 2:9 absent[1] - 20:15 absolutely[1] - 21:25 accord[1] - 10:7 accordingly[1] - 10:21 account[1] - 7:13 accrued[1] - 12:14 acknowledge[2] - 8:25, 10:25 ACTION[1] - 1:3 added[1] - 15:14 addition[2] - 15:13, 16:23 additions[1] - 14:7 address[7] - 8:15, 12:2, 15:12, 16:6, 17:5, 17:9, 23:2 addressed[5] - 5:5, 5:6, 5:7, 7:14, 12:22 addresses[4] - 4:18, 6:3, 6:5, 9:19 addressing[3] - 14:14, 16:15, 24:5 adequate[1] - 8:4 adhere[1] - 8:7 adjourned[1] - 26:14 adjusting[1] - 19:12 admit[2] - 10:25, 12:12</p> <p>B</p> <p>background[3] - 5:10, 8:12, 15:17 backtrack[1] - 20:25 barred[1] - 11:16 based[2] - 16:9, 20:16 Basking[1] - 3:17</p>
---	--	---

<p>BATON [6] - 1:14, 17:20, 19:25, 20:11, 22:9, 23:11</p> <p>Baton [4] - 17:20, 20:1, 20:11, 22:9</p> <p>Baxter [1] - 13:20</p> <p>bear [1] - 4:7</p> <p>Becker [1] - 2:6</p> <p>behalf [2] - 21:23, 24:14</p> <p>behind [1] - 6:14</p> <p>BENSON [1] - 3:2</p> <p>BERGMAN [1] - 2:18</p> <p>beyond [1] - 18:16</p> <p>Bill [4] - 17:20, 19:25, 20:11, 22:9</p> <p>boilerplate [3] - 10:2, 10:5, 10:7</p> <p>bottom [1] - 4:22</p> <p>BRIAN [1] - 1:19</p> <p>brief [1] - 14:10</p> <p>briefly [1] - 11:19</p> <p>briefs [1] - 4:15</p> <p>BRINKS [1] - 2:11</p> <p>BRODY [1] - 2:5</p> <p>Brunswick [1] - 2:17</p> <p>Bumb [14] - 17:14, 17:16, 18:14, 18:20, 19:2, 19:10, 20:2, 20:8, 21:20, 22:23, 23:1, 23:3, 23:10, 24:22</p> <p>Bumb's [1] - 24:1</p> <p>burning [1] - 19:17</p> <p>BY [14] - 1:14, 1:17, 2:2, 2:6, 2:9, 2:12, 2:15, 2:19, 2:22, 3:2, 3:6, 3:9, 3:12, 3:16</p> <p>BYRNE [1] - 2:5</p>	<p>22:13, 22:25, 23:13, 23:15, 23:16, 23:18, 23:19, 23:21, 24:4, 25:6, 25:7, 25:8, 25:17, 26:10</p> <p>cases [3] - 7:24, 8:5, 22:1</p> <p>CATHERINE [1] - 1:18</p> <p>CECCHI [1] - 2:5</p> <p>Center [1] - 3:6</p> <p>certainly [4] - 19:17, 22:11, 24:14, 24:22</p> <p>certify [1] - 26:21</p> <p>cetera [1] - 20:5</p> <p>change [1] - 19:8</p> <p>changed [1] - 19:22</p> <p>changing [1] - 11:8</p> <p>Chapel [1] - 3:7</p> <p>chart [1] - 14:18</p> <p>charts [1] - 6:15</p> <p>Cherry [1] - 3:7</p> <p>Chicago [2] - 2:4, 2:13</p> <p>chief [1] - 8:24</p> <p>Chief [3] - 17:22, 17:25, 20:15</p> <p>choose [1] - 7:17</p> <p>Circuit [2] - 13:13, 13:20</p> <p>circumstances [2] - 15:6, 18:9</p> <p>circumvent [1] - 7:1</p> <p>cited [7] - 13:14, 13:24, 14:2, 14:7, 15:9, 15:10, 16:21</p> <p>citing [2] - 7:10, 13:6</p> <p>Cityfront [1] - 2:13</p> <p>Civil [1] - 6:10</p> <p>CIVIL [1] - 1:3</p> <p>claim [5] - 4:23, 6:15, 11:13, 12:4, 14:12</p> <p>Claim [6] - 8:20, 8:23, 9:4, 9:5, 9:12, 10:14</p> <p>claimed [1] - 11:3</p> <p>Claims [12] - 8:23, 9:1, 9:3, 9:5, 9:8, 9:16, 10:5, 10:12, 10:16, 10:19, 10:23, 16:2</p> <p>claims [2] - 9:7, 9:8</p> <p>classic [1] - 14:3</p> <p>clear [6] - 6:17, 6:21, 14:2, 15:20, 18:3, 23:12</p> <p>clearly [1] - 23:10</p> <p>close [3] - 18:4, 21:3, 21:11</p> <p>Cockcroft [5] - 4:20, 9:18, 11:6, 11:14, 11:16</p> <p>Cockcroft's [1] - 11:4</p> <p>cognizant [1] - 20:4</p>	<p>COHEN [1] - 3:6</p> <p>COLLEEN [1] - 1:17</p> <p>Columbia [1] - 2:23</p> <p>combination [5] - 14:9, 15:1, 15:13, 16:18, 16:24</p> <p>combinations [6] - 14:6, 14:9, 14:13, 14:20, 15:14, 16:17</p> <p>Commencing [1] - 1:10</p> <p>comment [1] - 11:19</p> <p>Commerce [1] - 3:6</p> <p>complete [3] - 10:9, 23:14, 23:16</p> <p>completion [2] - 4:17, 18:15</p> <p>complexities [1] - 20:23</p> <p>compound [13] - 17:22, 18:7, 18:12, 18:17, 20:14, 20:17, 21:3, 21:8, 21:12, 23:13, 23:18, 23:19, 25:8</p> <p>computer [1] - 1:24</p> <p>computer-aided [1] - 1:24</p> <p>concerns [2] - 13:5, 24:1</p> <p>confer [1] - 26:4</p> <p>conference [3] - 5:24, 19:5, 19:18</p> <p>conferring [1] - 18:13</p> <p>confirmed [2] - 4:7, 17:8</p> <p>connected [1] - 21:19</p> <p>connection [1] - 26:3</p> <p>consensus [2] - 18:20, 21:20</p> <p>conservative [1] - 6:15</p> <p>consider [2] - 20:7, 20:12</p> <p>considered [1] - 13:21</p> <p>construction [3] - 12:5, 12:15, 16:9</p> <p>contained [1] - 7:8</p> <p>contemplated [1] - 18:17</p> <p>content [2] - 5:14, 6:4</p> <p>contention [2] - 6:4, 26:3</p> <p>contentions [47] - 4:25, 5:14, 5:16, 5:17, 5:20, 6:6, 6:8, 6:16, 6:18, 6:22, 7:3, 7:6, 7:9, 7:10, 7:13, 8:2, 8:11, 8:22, 9:3, 9:7, 9:11, 9:15, 10:3,</p>	<p>10:6, 10:12, 10:14, 10:15, 11:1, 11:9, 11:14, 11:17, 11:22, 12:3, 12:6, 12:7, 12:13, 12:17, 12:19, 13:5, 13:8, 14:15, 14:17, 14:19, 15:8, 15:15, 15:16, 15:18, 16:6, 20:13, 20:20, 21:18, 25:9, 25:12, 26:2</p> <p>Deanne [1] - 24:7</p> <p>decided [2] - 20:10, 23:1</p> <p>DECIDING [1] - 1:5</p> <p>decision [4] - 20:15, 21:10, 21:11, 25:24</p> <p>decisions [1] - 7:19</p> <p>defendant [2] - 11:6, 20:14</p> <p>Defendant [12] - 2:4, 2:7, 2:10, 2:14, 2:17, 2:21, 2:24, 3:4, 3:8, 3:11, 3:14, 3:17</p> <p>defendants [39] - 4:11, 5:15, 7:6, 7:9, 8:20, 8:25, 9:3, 9:6, 9:10, 9:14, 10:11, 10:15, 11:8, 11:13, 11:21, 11:24, 12:5, 12:7, 12:12, 12:13, 12:18, 13:3, 13:5, 13:9, 14:13, 14:16, 14:17, 14:19, 15:8, 15:15, 15:16, 15:18, 16:6, 20:13, 20:20, 21:18, 25:9, 25:12, 26:2</p> <p>Defendants [1] - 1:8</p> <p>defendants' [38] - 4:10, 4:13, 4:24, 5:5, 5:6, 5:7, 5:20, 7:5, 7:6, 7:7, 7:8, 8:22, 9:23, 9:25, 10:1, 10:5, 10:15, 10:21, 11:1, 11:17, 11:19, 12:3, 12:10, 12:17, 12:22, 13:7, 13:12, 14:1, 14:25, 15:10, 15:11, 15:25, 16:3, 16:8, 16:13, 16:15, 17:1, 17:4</p> <p>DEFENDANTS' [1] - 1:7</p> <p>defense [16] - 9:16, 9:19, 9:20, 10:4, 10:12, 10:20, 10:23, 12:12, 12:16, 12:22, 14:1, 16:1, 16:4, 16:9, 16:13, 16:15</p> <p>defenses [2] - 7:11, 9:24</p> <p>defining [1] - 9:7</p> <p>definitions [1] - 10:2</p> <p>delaying [2] - 22:6, 23:5</p> <p>delightful [1] - 26:7</p> <p>denied [6] - 8:14, 14:2, 16:13, 16:17, 16:22, 16:24</p> <p>departure [1] - 22:19</p>

dependent [1] - 9:4 depositions [2] - 25:1, 25:2 description [8] - 8:18, 8:20, 8:21, 9:2, 9:16, 10:4, 10:12, 10:22 designed [1] - 6:15 desire [1] - 19:17 determine [1] - 7:4 differences [1] - 25:11 different [8] - 8:17, 14:7, 16:22, 17:11, 21:16, 22:21, 23:1, 23:9 diligently [1] - 25:13 direct [2] - 19:2, 20:8 directed [2] - 4:11, 11:20 directly [1] - 13:13 disclosed [16] - 8:8, 8:20, 12:13, 12:16, 14:6, 14:10, 14:13, 14:24, 15:2, 15:4, 15:17, 15:22, 16:17, 16:21, 17:1 disclosure [4] - 8:3, 14:19, 26:2, 26:4 disclosures [2] - 6:8, 10:10 discovery [8] - 4:6, 11:20, 11:23, 11:24, 12:1, 18:10, 18:15, 24:15 discussed [1] - 8:13 discusses [1] - 5:9 discussing [1] - 18:6 discussion [4] - 7:24, 12:25, 15:5, 23:14 discussions [5] - 7:15, 18:18, 20:3, 22:11, 22:15 dispute [4] - 6:2, 7:12, 8:10, 12:22 disputes [2] - 11:25, 12:1 DISTRICT [2] - 1:1, 1:1 District [3] - 6:25, 7:20, 7:22 divided [2] - 5:4, 14:5 DKT [1] - 1:6 Docket [3] - 4:9, 5:23, 14:11 Doctors [1] - 4:20 documents [7] - 6:5, 6:8, 6:18, 6:19, 13:1, 16:12, 24:25 Dohme [1] - 6:24 done [4] - 19:18, 22:5, 22:7, 24:3	door [1] - 15:15 doubtful [1] - 19:5 Drive [1] - 2:13 Dupont [1] - 13:12 during [1] - 22:10	4:13, 4:19, 4:23, 5:20, 5:22, 6:20, 6:21, 6:23, 7:2, 7:5, 9:18, 10:22, 12:10, 14:25, 15:10, 15:25, 16:8, 16:15, 17:3, 17:4, 17:6, 18:10, 24:15, 24:16, 25:2 EXPERT [1] - 1:7 experts [5] - 4:23, 7:7, 16:3, 16:6, 24:24 explain [2] - 13:15, 13:22 explicitly [2] - 9:1, 9:21 extensive [1] - 4:15 extent [4] - 4:12, 11:14, 11:21, 22:16 extrinsic [5] - 13:4, 13:15, 13:17, 13:21, 13:25	forms [3] - 11:2, 16:5, 16:7 FORSATZ [1] - 1:19 forth [7] - 5:11, 5:13, 8:1, 9:1, 9:21, 13:7, 15:24 four [4] - 16:11, 18:3, 21:2, 21:11 FOX [1] - 3:9 freely [1] - 6:11 Friedlander [2] - 1:22, 26:23 friedlanderreporter @gmail.com [1] - 1:22 front [1] - 20:6 full [3] - 8:3, 10:9, 11:10 fulsome [2] - 8:10, 10:9 future [1] - 19:16	herein [2] - 7:16, 7:25 HERSHY [1] - 3:3 hi [1] - 4:2 highlights [1] - 14:11 HILL [1] - 2:8 Hill [1] - 3:7 Honor [15] - 17:20, 17:21, 17:24, 18:21, 19:25, 20:11, 21:22, 22:9, 23:11, 24:7, 24:8, 24:14, 25:22, 26:16, 26:18 HONORABLE [1] - 1:11 hoops [1] - 9:23 hope [1] - 26:13 hopefully [1] - 23:25 Horizon [1] - 7:21 Hubbard [1] - 2:3 huge [1] - 25:3 hundred [1] - 17:13 hydrate [2] - 12:25, 16:11
		F	G	I
		F.2d [1] - 13:20 F.3d [1] - 13:13 endeavor [1] - 7:4 endeavoring [1] - 20:5 enter [1] - 20:15 entered [4] - 4:7, 15:25, 17:8, 17:25 entitled [1] - 26:22 era [1] - 23:16 ERIC [1] - 2:9 ESCANLAR [1] - 2:22 especially [1] - 15:18 ESQUIRE [22] - 1:14, 1:17, 1:18, 1:18, 1:19, 2:2, 2:6, 2:9, 2:12, 2:12, 2:15, 2:16, 2:19, 2:19, 2:22, 3:2, 3:3, 3:6, 3:9, 3:12, 3:13, 3:16 essentially [3] - 12:12, 18:1, 21:16 establish [1] - 8:2 et [3] - 1:4, 1:7, 20:4 Etter [2] - 14:23, 16:18 evidence [14] - 7:10, 11:7, 13:4, 13:7, 13:10, 13:15, 13:17, 13:21, 13:25, 16:25, 18:4, 21:3, 21:11 EWING [1] - 1:14 except [3] - 4:11, 16:17, 16:24 exchanged [1] - 6:9 excuse [1] - 11:21 expand [1] - 13:22 expect [1] - 26:1 expert [27] - 4:10,	gander [1] - 26:12 general [6] - 5:4, 5:10, 6:1, 10:2, 10:7, 12:21 GILSON [1] - 2:11 given [3] - 6:11, 24:24, 25:7 GOLDSTEIN [1] - 3:9 goose [1] - 26:11 governed [1] - 6:6 granted [2] - 6:13, 8:14 great [1] - 25:25 greatly [1] - 26:17 GREENBERG [1] - 3:5 Greenwich [1] - 2:20 guess [3] - 20:23, 22:21, 26:13	i.e [1] - 11:17 ice [2] - 22:25, 23:13 ideally [1] - 24:18 identified [1] - 6:19 identify [2] - 6:18, 9:23 IL [1] - 2:13 Illinois [1] - 2:4 impact [1] - 22:6 impermissibly [2] - 6:22, 7:5 improperly [1] - 4:24 INC [1] - 1:7 include [3] - 9:15, 15:15, 18:21 included [3] - 7:3, 9:3, 9:8 includes [1] - 10:5 including [1] - 7:2 incorporated [3] - 7:15, 7:25, 9:10 incorporation [3] - 10:2, 10:6, 10:7 incorporations [1] - 9:13 indefinite [6] - 10:14, 12:4, 12:8, 12:10, 12:14, 16:9 indefiniteness [2] - 8:19, 12:2 inferences [1] - 9:23 infinite [1] - 15:15 information [2] - 5:10, 8:4
			H	
			hampered [1] - 18:10 HAND [1] - 2:15 hands [1] - 25:21 happy [1] - 18:22 heading [2] - 10:13, 10:19 hear [5] - 23:6, 23:7, 24:11, 24:12, 24:13 heard [3] - 21:22, 21:23, 22:19 held [2] - 4:15, 26:1 hemihydrate [7] - 11:3, 11:5, 11:8, 12:4, 12:9, 16:6, 16:10	

<p><i>infringement</i> [1] - 6:4 <i>inquired</i> [1] - 17:21 <i>instead</i> [3] - 10:15, 13:4, 13:6 <i>instructive</i> [1] - 13:14 <i>intended</i> [1] - 10:11 <i>intending</i> [1] - 18:19 <i>interest</i> [1] - 22:4 <i>internal</i> [2] - 13:1, 16:12 <i>interpret</i> [1] - 13:17 <i>invalid</i> [1] - 9:1 <i>invalidity</i> [12] - 4:24, 5:5, 5:16, 6:5, 8:16, 9:16, 9:19, 10:3, 10:6, 10:22, 15:11, 16:1 <i>InValidity</i> [1] - 10:19 <i>involved</i> [1] - 19:7 <i>involves</i> [1] - 5:12 <i>issue</i> [12] - 5:21, 11:12, 11:24, 14:4, 14:5, 14:11, 14:21, 17:9, 22:24, 23:6, 24:25 <i>issues</i> [10] - 7:12, 20:12, 22:22, 23:1, 23:2, 23:7, 24:5, 24:23, 25:18, 26:4</p>	<p>6:1, 17:12, 18:11, 19:5, 19:19, 22:13, 22:14, 22:18, 22:23 <i>justice</i> [1] - 6:11 <i>justify</i> [1] - 11:21</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K</p> <p><i>Karen</i> [3] - 1:22, 4:3, 26:23 <i>KASOWITZ</i> [1] - 3:2 <i>KATHERINE</i> [1] - 2:22 <i>keep</i> [1] - 19:23 <i>KESSLER</i> [1] - 3:9 <i>KIM</i> [1] - 3:9 <i>kind</i> [1] - 18:19 <i>knowledge</i> [2] - 14:8, 15:13</p>	<p><i>local</i> [5] - 6:3, 6:4, 7:2, 8:1, 8:10 <i>Local</i> [6] - 5:1, 5:13, 6:6, 6:20, 10:8, 13:9 <i>loops</i> [1] - 9:23 <i>lose</i> [1] - 24:10 <i>love</i> [1] - 22:7 <i>Ltd</i> [2] - 3:8, 3:11 <i>Lupin</i> [3] - 2:4, 2:7, 24:14 <i>Lupin's</i> [1] - 25:5</p> <p style="text-align: center;">M</p> <p><i>Madison</i> [1] - 1:19 <i>MAGISTRATE</i> [1] - 1:12 <i>manner</i> [1] - 23:15 <i>MARC</i> [1] - 2:16 <i>MARCH</i> [1] - 1:5 <i>March</i> [7] - 4:9, 4:25, 5:15, 5:18, 5:23, 12:17, 14:10 <i>MARK</i> [1] - 2:12 <i>market</i> [4] - 18:2, 20:15, 20:21, 22:4 <i>Markman</i> [3] - 12:15, 12:18, 12:19 <i>Martinsville</i> [1] - 3:16 <i>material</i> [1] - 23:5 <i>matter</i> [2] - 4:8, 26:22 <i>MATTES</i> [1] - 1:18 <i>Mazzochi</i> [3] - 24:7, 24:13, 25:23 <i>MAZZOCHI</i> [8] - 2:2, 2:2, 24:7, 24:10, 24:12, 25:22, 26:8, 26:15 <i>mean</i> [2] - 20:25, 23:12 <i>meaning</i> [1] - 13:22 <i>means</i> [1] - 22:18 <i>meant</i> [1] - 13:19 <i>mechanical</i> [1] - 1:24 <i>meet</i> [1] - 26:4 <i>MELISSA</i> [1] - 2:6 <i>Merck</i> [1] - 6:24 <i>merit</i> [1] - 15:5 <i>MIDLIGE</i> [1] - 3:15 <i>might</i> [1] - 23:18 <i>mind</i> [1] - 25:18 <i>mind-numbing</i> [1] - 25:18 <i>misled</i> [1] - 10:19 <i>mitsubishi</i> [1] - 1:3 <i>MOLINO</i> [1] - 2:2 <i>Monday</i> [2] - 24:6, 26:14 <i>Monsanto</i> [2] - 13:12, 13:16</p>	<p><i>month</i> [1] - 24:22 <i>months</i> [3] - 18:3, 21:2, 21:11 <i>MOORE</i> [1] - 2:19 <i>most</i> [2] - 22:3, 25:12 <i>move</i> [2] - 4:22, 24:16 <i>moved</i> [3] - 12:6, 12:18, 19:22 <i>moves</i> [1] - 19:10 <i>MR</i> [7] - 17:20, 19:25, 20:11, 21:22, 21:25, 22:9, 23:11 <i>MS</i> [7] - 24:7, 24:10, 24:12, 25:22, 26:8, 26:15, 26:16 <i>MSN</i> [2] - 3:14, 3:17 <i>must</i> [5] - 6:5, 6:19, 6:23, 7:4, 7:12</p> <p style="text-align: center;">N</p> <p><i>N.W</i> [2] - 3:10, 3:13 <i>nature</i> [1] - 25:5 <i>near</i> [1] - 22:14 <i>necessarily</i> [2] - 20:10, 22:18 <i>need</i> [8] - 21:19, 22:13, 23:20, 23:21, 24:3, 25:3, 25:6, 25:10 <i>needs</i> [1] - 23:10 <i>NEILON</i> [1] - 2:19 <i>never</i> [1] - 12:6 <i>nevertheless</i> [1] - 9:2 <i>NEW</i> [1] - 1:1 <i>New</i> [7] - 1:20, 3:3, 3:10, 6:25, 7:20, 7:22, 10:8 <i>new</i> [5] - 11:21, 13:6, 14:12, 15:4, 16:16 <i>Newark</i> [1] - 1:15 <i>next</i> [1] - 8:15 <i>nice</i> [1] - 25:16 <i>NIMROD</i> [1] - 1:18 <i>NJ</i> [7] - 1:15, 2:7, 2:10, 2:17, 2:23, 3:7, 3:17 <i>NO</i> [1] - 1:6 <i>noted</i> [7] - 4:23, 5:22, 7:1, 7:24, 8:9, 13:16, 17:24 <i>nothing</i> [3] - 23:13, 26:9, 26:14 <i>notice</i> [2] - 8:4, 14:20 <i>notify</i> [1] - 10:4 <i>November</i> [2] - 5:19, 7:21 <i>nowhere</i> [1] - 12:3 <i>nuanced</i> [1] - 10:25 <i>number</i> [1] - 15:16</p>	<p><i>NUMBER</i> [1] - 1:3 <i>numbing</i> [1] - 25:18 <i>NW</i> [1] - 3:3 <i>NY</i> [1] - 1:20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">O</p> <p><i>object</i> [1] - 7:8 <i>objecting</i> [1] - 14:14 <i>objection</i> [2] - 23:5, 23:8 <i>obviate</i> [2] - 23:20, 23:21 <i>obviously</i> [8] - 5:11, 5:13, 17:10, 17:23, 20:6, 21:6, 25:24, 26:1 <i>obviousness</i> [3] - 5:6, 14:4, 16:15 <i>OF</i> [2] - 1:1, 1:7 <i>offered</i> [1] - 13:15 <i>Official</i> [1] - 1:22 <i>OLSTEIN</i> [1] - 2:5 <i>once</i> [2] - 8:8, 20:11 <i>one</i> [20] - 5:5, 7:7, 8:18, 14:5, 14:23, 16:16, 17:9, 17:13, 20:12, 20:13, 22:1, 22:16, 22:22, 22:23, 23:9, 24:15, 24:18, 24:23, 25:15, 26:10 <i>One</i> [2] - 1:15, 15:25 <i>ongoing</i> [2] - 18:18, 20:3 <i>opinion</i> [5] - 4:5, 4:8, 4:16, 14:2, 17:7 <i>OPINION</i> [1] - 1:5 <i>opinions</i> [4] - 7:14, 7:17, 7:18, 8:1 <i>oral</i> [8] - 4:15, 4:16, 4:17, 5:3, 11:11, 12:13, 14:2, 17:7 <i>ORAL</i> [1] - 1:5 <i>order</i> [16] - 4:7, 5:2, 8:6, 15:24, 17:5, 17:8, 17:25, 18:12, 19:10, 19:13, 19:18, 19:21, 19:23, 20:4, 21:1, 24:4 <i>ordered</i> [3] - 17:2, 17:5, 17:13 <i>ordinary</i> [6] - 11:1, 11:4, 11:7, 13:19, 14:8, 16:4 <i>otherwise</i> [2] - 6:19, 20:21 <i>ought</i> [2] - 19:2, 23:6 <i>overseas</i> [1] - 24:23</p>
---	---	---	--	--

P	R
<p>P.C [1] - 2:5</p> <p>p.m [3] - 1:10, 4:1, 26:19</p> <p>Page [9] - 9:7, 9:11, 10:15, 11:11, 12:15, 13:11, 13:13, 13:20, 14:10</p> <p>paragraph [1] - 12:10</p> <p>Park [1] - 2:23</p> <p>part [3] - 6:14, 8:14</p> <p>PARTIES [1] - 4:1</p> <p>parties [19] - 5:3, 5:11, 5:12, 8:2, 8:4, 8:6, 8:10, 13:10, 18:6, 18:10, 18:12, 19:11, 19:17, 20:2, 24:1, 24:14, 24:16, 24:19, 25:1</p> <p>parties' [2] - 5:14, 7:3</p> <p>party [2] - 6:17, 7:1</p> <p>party's [2] - 6:16, 6:22</p> <p>Patent [11] - 5:1, 5:13, 6:3, 6:4, 6:7, 6:12, 6:20, 8:21, 10:8, 10:14, 13:9</p> <p>patent [6] - 5:11, 9:9, 9:17, 16:2, 17:17, 23:21</p> <p>patents [2] - 5:12, 21:16</p> <p>PC [1] - 3:5</p> <p>percent [1] - 17:13</p> <p>perfect [2] - 14:17, 14:18</p> <p>perfectly [1] - 19:14</p> <p>period [1] - 25:4</p> <p>permitted [1] - 15:8</p> <p>person [7] - 11:1, 11:4, 11:7, 13:19, 14:8, 16:4, 19:6</p> <p>perspective [1] - 25:5</p> <p>PHARMA [2] - 1:3, 1:7</p> <p>Pharma [1] - 7:21</p> <p>philosophy [1] - 6:14</p> <p>phone [1] - 19:6</p> <p>phrase [1] - 12:8</p> <p>piece [1] - 13:10</p> <p>place [3] - 17:12, 21:2, 22:18</p> <p>Plaintiff [2] - 1:16, 1:20</p> <p>plaintiff [2] - 7:8, 11:10</p> <p>Plaintiffs [1] - 1:5</p> <p>plaintiffs [34] - 4:22, 4:23, 5:5, 5:6, 5:7, 5:16, 5:19, 8:17, 8:20, 9:14, 9:22,</p> <p>10:1, 10:18, 10:24, 10:25, 11:3, 12:3, 12:4, 12:24, 13:2, 14:12, 14:14, 14:20, 15:7, 15:14, 17:21, 20:18, 20:19, 22:3, 23:12, 23:19, 25:12, 26:1, 26:5</p> <p>PLAINTIFFS' [1] - 1:5</p> <p>plaintiffs' [27] - 4:6, 4:9, 4:18, 5:4, 5:12, 5:21, 8:13, 8:14, 8:15, 8:24, 11:12, 11:20, 11:22, 12:5, 12:9, 13:25, 14:10, 14:15, 15:8, 15:19, 16:11, 16:14, 16:16, 16:20, 16:23, 17:3, 20:24</p> <p>Plaza [2] - 1:15, 2:13</p> <p>point [4] - 13:14, 22:16, 22:17, 23:17</p> <p>pointed [1] - 22:3</p> <p>polymorph [2] - 23:20, 23:21</p> <p>portion [1] - 4:13</p> <p>PORTIONS [1] - 1:7</p> <p>portions [14] - 4:10, 4:22, 5:22, 6:23, 9:18, 10:21, 15:9, 15:25, 16:3, 16:8, 16:14, 16:20, 17:2, 17:4</p> <p>POSA [5] - 15:13, 15:20, 16:7, 16:24</p> <p>position [6] - 20:24, 22:12, 23:9, 23:18, 25:6</p> <p>possibility [1] - 23:22</p> <p>possible [2] - 8:11, 22:5</p> <p>postponed [1] - 25:4</p> <p>postponement [1] - 17:17</p> <p>postponing [1] - 23:5</p> <p>posture [1] - 25:7</p> <p>potential [1] - 20:7</p> <p>potentially [1] - 18:8</p> <p>preparation [3] - 19:9, 19:13, 24:4</p> <p>prepare [1] - 19:14</p> <p>prepared [1] - 4:19</p> <p>present [8] - 5:24, 7:18, 14:18, 18:20, 18:23, 21:6, 21:20, 24:18</p> <p>presenting [1] - 25:14</p> <p>presently [1] - 5:25</p> <p>pressing [1] - 22:3</p> <p>pretrial [8] - 5:24,</p> <p>19:4, 19:10, 19:13, 19:18, 19:23, 20:4, 24:4</p> <p>prevent [1] - 6:16</p> <p>prevents [1] - 18:1</p> <p>previous [1] - 7:15</p> <p>previously [7] - 14:6, 14:24, 15:1, 15:3, 15:22, 16:17, 16:21</p> <p>primarily [1] - 7:18</p> <p>Princeton [1] - 2:10</p> <p>principles [1] - 6:2</p> <p>problem [1] - 19:15</p> <p>procedural [2] - 25:7, 25:9</p> <p>Procedure [1] - 6:10</p> <p>proceed [2] - 8:12, 17:23</p> <p>Proceedings [1] - 1:24</p> <p>proceedings [1] - 26:22</p> <p>process [2] - 7:14, 24:17</p> <p>produce [2] - 6:18, 11:22</p> <p>produced [3] - 1:24, 6:5, 6:19</p> <p>product [6] - 11:15, 11:17, 16:7, 21:15, 22:2, 22:4</p> <p>proffered [1] - 13:16</p> <p>progress [1] - 24:20</p> <p>proposal [1] - 22:13</p> <p>propose [1] - 20:2</p> <p>proposed [3] - 18:14, 22:14, 25:15</p> <p>provides [1] - 8:3</p> <p>providing [1] - 11:6</p> <p>provisos [2] - 14:16, 14:22</p> <p>purports [1] - 11:14</p> <p>purpose [4] - 7:13, 14:7, 15:4, 16:22</p> <p>purposes [2] - 7:18, 14:18</p> <p>pursuant [2] - 5:2, 6:20</p> <p>pushed [1] - 19:16</p> <p>put [8] - 4:5, 14:17, 14:19, 20:25, 21:1, 22:25, 23:13, 23:23</p> <p>Putnam [1] - 2:20</p> <p>Q</p> <p>quickly [1] - 25:7</p> <p>QUINN [1] - 1:17</p> <p>quite [2] - 24:20, 25:13</p>	<p>rely [2] - 7:18, 16:25</p> <p>REMUS [1] - 2:12</p> <p>reply [1] - 24:16</p> <p>report [7] - 6:20, 6:21, 6:23, 9:18, 9:19, 11:4, 12:23</p> <p>Reporter [1] - 1:22</p> <p>REPORTER [1] - 4:4</p> <p>Reporter/</p> <p>Transcriber [1] - 26:23</p> <p>REPORTS [1] - 1:7</p> <p>reports [20] - 4:10, 4:13, 4:19, 4:23, 5:20, 5:23, 7:2, 7:5, 7:7, 10:22, 12:11, 14:25, 15:10, 15:25, 16:3, 16:8, 16:15, 17:3, 17:4, 24:16</p> <p>request [5] - 16:11, 16:14, 16:16, 16:20, 16:23</p> <p>require [4] - 8:2, 8:3, 8:10, 13:10</p> <p>required [5] - 5:13, 6:3, 6:8, 9:24, 10:8</p> <p>requirement [1] - 8:22</p> <p>requirements [1] - 7:13</p> <p>requires [2] - 5:1, 6:11</p> <p>requiring [1] - 10:9</p> <p>rescheduled [1] - 18:5</p> <p>respect [1] - 8:23</p> <p>respectful [1] - 24:1</p> <p>respond [2] - 15:8, 22:10</p> <p>responded [2] - 5:16, 5:19</p> <p>response [1] - 13:3</p> <p>RESPONSE [1] - 26:18</p> <p>responses [1] - 11:20</p> <p>result [1] - 7:4</p> <p>RICHTER [2] - 3:15, 3:16</p> <p>Ridge [1] - 3:17</p> <p>ripe [1] - 18:23</p> <p>Riverfront [1] - 1:15</p> <p>RMR [1] - 26:23</p> <p>Road [3] - 2:6, 2:9, 3:16</p> <p>Roseland [1] - 2:7</p> <p>Roszel [1] - 2:9</p> <p>Route [1] - 2:16</p> <p>Rule [7] - 5:1, 6:3, 6:4, 6:7, 6:10, 6:12, 6:20</p> <p>rule [1] - 6:7</p> <p>ruled [1] - 13:14</p> <p>rules [7] - 7:2, 8:2, 8:3, 8:10, 11:12,</p>

<p>13:12, 26:10 Rules [3] - 5:13, 10:8, 13:9 ruling [8] - 4:12, 4:13, 7:12, 12:18, 12:19, 14:22, 17:8, 20:22 rulings [2] - 5:10, 15:23 rush [1] - 25:10</p>	<p>showing [2] - 6:13, 11:9 shy [1] - 11:25 sides [2] - 23:6, 23:7 silent [1] - 8:22 simply [5] - 7:10, 11:6, 11:9, 11:23, 12:24 situation [1] - 18:7 SIWIK [1] - 2:2 skill [6] - 11:2, 11:4, 11:7, 13:19, 14:8, 16:5 solely [2] - 17:3, 19:3 Solutions [1] - 7:20 somewhat [1] - 18:8 soon [2] - 22:5, 22:7 sooner [1] - 22:4 sorry [1] - 24:8 sort [2] - 17:15, 21:18 specifically [3] - 8:25, 10:16, 10:20 spirit [1] - 10:8 standards [1] - 26:2 statements [1] - 10:3 STATES [2] - 1:1, 1:12 status [1] - 18:25 stenography [1] - 1:24 STERN [1] - 3:3 STERNE [1] - 3:9 STEVEN [1] - 2:19 still [4] - 21:7, 21:8, 21:10, 24:8 STRAWN [1] - 3:12 Street [2] - 2:3, 3:13 stricken [10] - 6:23, 10:14, 10:18, 11:10, 12:15, 13:10, 13:19, 25:13, 26:3, 26:5 seek [1] - 13:2 SEEKING [1] - 1:6 seeking [1] - 5:22 sense [2] - 20:19, 23:15 September [1] - 5:18 sequenced [1] - 22:1 serve [1] - 8:10 served [5] - 4:20, 4:25, 5:21, 10:11, 12:17 set [10] - 5:10, 5:13, 8:1, 9:1, 9:21, 13:7, 15:24, 17:12, 19:8, 26:10 settled [1] - 25:17 several [2] - 9:12, 25:9 shall [1] - 15:2 SHARON [1] - 3:13 Sharp [1] - 6:24 shed [1] - 13:18 shifting [1] - 6:16</p>	<p>suggesting [1] - 23:12 Suite [5] - 1:15, 2:3, 2:16, 2:23, 3:3 SULLIVAN [1] - 1:17 sum [1] - 15:23 summarized [1] - 15:24 supplemental [1] - 5:20 supplemented [1] - 5:18 support [2] - 13:7, 13:16 supporting [1] - 7:10 suppose [1] - 19:4</p>	<p>tied [1] - 21:13 timely [3] - 8:3, 8:11, 23:15 timing [3] - 5:14, 6:3, 17:10 TO [1] - 1:6 today [3] - 18:24, 23:19, 25:24 together [1] - 21:13 top [1] - 9:11 TORRES [1] - 3:2 TRACY [1] - 1:17 transcript [5] - 1:24, 11:10, 12:15, 13:11, 26:21 transcription [1] - 1:24 Travenol [1] - 13:20 Trevor [1] - 21:23 TREVOR [1] - 3:2 trial [23] - 5:25, 17:12, 17:23, 18:4, 18:14, 18:15, 19:8, 19:11, 19:15, 19:21, 19:22, 21:3, 22:14, 22:18, 22:19, 22:23, 23:6, 23:16, 23:20, 23:22, 25:3 tried [1] - 22:25 trouble [1] - 26:6 true [2] - 6:14, 8:6 try [8] - 18:11, 20:10, 22:13, 23:25, 24:18, 25:6, 26:4, 26:8 trying [5] - 21:17, 24:17, 24:24, 25:4, 25:13 Turnpike [1] - 2:23 turns [4] - 10:24, 12:21, 14:4, 19:10 two [11] - 5:6, 7:9, 7:24, 8:18, 14:6, 14:16, 14:22, 16:3, 16:20, 22:1, 23:1 type [1] - 10:6</p>	<p>validity [1] - 14:15 various [1] - 4:19 versus [3] - 6:24, 7:19, 13:12 VIA [1] - 4:1 via [1] - 6:20 view [1] - 22:5 violates [1] - 5:1 volume [1] - 24:25</p>
<p>S safe [1] - 26:13 SAIBER [1] - 2:22 Sandoz [7] - 2:10, 2:14, 4:12, 4:14, 5:18, 6:24, 17:6 Sandoz's [3] - 5:17, 5:20, 10:6 sands [1] - 6:16 satisfy [1] - 8:21 SAUL [1] - 1:14 schedule [3] - 18:13, 23:24, 24:18 scheduled [4] - 5:25, 17:24, 19:5 scheduling [1] - 19:3 Schneider [1] - 4:2 SCHNEIDER [1] - 1:11 scope [1] - 11:10 second [4] - 9:21, 12:21, 15:3, 22:24 Section [5] - 5:5, 8:15, 9:11, 10:20, 16:1 see [10] - 6:23, 10:14, 10:18, 11:10, 12:15, 13:10, 13:19, 25:13, 26:3, 26:5 seek [1] - 13:2 SEEKING [1] - 1:6 seeking [1] - 5:22 sense [2] - 20:19, 23:15 sense [2] - 20:19, 23:15 September [1] - 5:18 sequenced [1] - 22:1 serve [1] - 8:10 served [5] - 4:20, 4:25, 5:21, 10:11, 12:17 set [10] - 5:10, 5:13, 8:1, 9:1, 9:21, 13:7, 15:24, 17:12, 19:8, 26:10 settled [1] - 25:17 several [2] - 9:12, 25:9 shall [1] - 15:2 SHARON [1] - 3:13 Sharp [1] - 6:24 shed [1] - 13:18 shifting [1] - 6:16</p>	<p>showing [2] - 6:13, 11:9 shy [1] - 11:25 sides [2] - 23:6, 23:7 silent [1] - 8:22 simply [5] - 7:10, 11:6, 11:9, 11:23, 12:24 situation [1] - 18:7 SIWIK [1] - 2:2 skill [6] - 11:2, 11:4, 11:7, 13:19, 14:8, 16:5 solely [2] - 17:3, 19:3 Solutions [1] - 7:20 somewhat [1] - 18:8 soon [2] - 22:5, 22:7 sooner [1] - 22:4 sorry [1] - 24:8 sort [2] - 17:15, 21:18 specifically [3] - 8:25, 10:16, 10:20 spirit [1] - 10:8 standards [1] - 26:2 statements [1] - 10:3 STATES [2] - 1:1, 1:12 status [1] - 18:25 stenography [1] - 1:24 STERN [1] - 3:3 STERNE [1] - 3:9 STEVEN [1] - 2:19 still [4] - 21:7, 21:8, 21:10, 24:8 STRAWN [1] - 3:12 Street [2] - 2:3, 3:13 stricken [10] - 6:23, 10:14, 10:18, 11:10, 12:15, 13:10, 13:19, 25:13, 26:3, 26:5 seek [1] - 13:2 SEEKING [1] - 1:6 seeking [1] - 5:22 sense [2] - 20:19, 23:15 sense [2] - 20:19, 23:15 September [1] - 5:18 sequenced [1] - 22:1 serve [1] - 8:10 served [5] - 4:20, 4:25, 5:21, 10:11, 12:17 set [10] - 5:10, 5:13, 8:1, 9:1, 9:21, 13:7, 15:24, 17:12, 19:8, 26:10 settled [1] - 25:17 several [2] - 9:12, 25:9 shall [1] - 15:2 SHARON [1] - 3:13 Sharp [1] - 6:24 shed [1] - 13:18 shifting [1] - 6:16</p>	<p>TANABE [1] - 1:3 Technologies [1] - 7:19 TELEPHONE [1] - 4:1 term [4] - 9:6, 12:4, 12:5, 12:8 terms [2] - 19:12, 25:11 testify [2] - 11:14, 11:16 testimony [1] - 11:15 THE [2] - 1:1, 1:11 The court [51] - 4:2, 4:4, 4:5, 4:9, 4:15, 5:9, 6:2, 7:4, 7:12, 7:17, 8:1, 8:9, 8:12, 8:15, 9:14, 9:17, 9:22, 9:24, 10:1, 10:24, 11:12, 11:19, 12:9, 12:21, 13:11, 13:14, 13:24, 14:4, 14:15, 14:18, 15:5, 15:18, 19:1, 20:6, 20:9, 21:6, 21:24, 22:21, 24:3, 24:9, 24:10, 24:11, 24:18, 25:16, 25:20, 25:23, 25:25, 26:6, 26:7, 26:9 theories [2] - 8:7, 8:8 theory [2] - 13:6, 13:7 therefore [7] - 4:12, 6:17, 9:17, 12:16, 13:1, 14:24, 15:23 they've [1] - 21:14 thinking [1] - 19:4 third [3] - 10:11, 12:2, 15:12 three [8] - 5:4, 5:7, 8:17, 8:19, 14:5, 14:7, 16:8, 16:23 subsection [3] - 14:9, 15:3, 15:12 subsections [2] - 8:18, 14:5 substance [1] - 14:15 sufficient [1] - 14:19 sufficiently [1] - 9:15</p>	<p>tied [1] - 21:13 timely [3] - 8:3, 8:11, 23:15 timing [3] - 5:14, 6:3, 17:10 TO [1] - 1:6 today [3] - 18:24, 23:19, 25:24 together [1] - 21:13 top [1] - 9:11 TORRES [1] - 3:2 TRACY [1] - 1:17 transcript [5] - 1:24, 11:10, 12:15, 13:11, 26:21 transcription [1] - 1:24 Travenol [1] - 13:20 Trevor [1] - 21:23 TREVOR [1] - 3:2 trial [23] - 5:25, 17:12, 17:23, 18:4, 18:14, 18:15, 19:8, 19:11, 19:15, 19:21, 19:22, 21:3, 22:14, 22:18, 22:19, 22:23, 23:6, 23:16, 23:20, 23:22, 25:3 tried [1] - 22:25 trouble [1] - 26:6 true [2] - 6:14, 8:6 try [8] - 18:11, 20:10, 22:13, 23:25, 24:18, 25:6, 26:4, 26:8 trying [5] - 21:17, 24:17, 24:24, 25:4, 25:13 Turnpike [1] - 2:23 turns [4] - 10:24, 12:21, 14:4, 19:10 two [11] - 5:6, 7:9, 7:24, 8:18, 14:6, 14:16, 14:22, 16:3, 16:20, 22:1, 23:1 type [1] - 10:6</p>	<p>wait [1] - 21:11 WALLACK [1] - 2:8 wants [1] - 22:23 Washington [2] - 3:4, 3:14 washington [1] - 3:10 Watson [1] - 7:21 week [1] - 24:21 Welch [1] - 21:23 WELCH [3] - 3:2, 21:22, 21:25 West [2] - 2:3, 3:7 Westlaw [3] - 6:24, 7:20, 7:22 WILLIAM [1] - 1:14 win [1] - 23:19 WINSTON [1] - 3:12 WITHERS [1] - 2:18 Wolfson [4] - 17:18, 17:22, 17:25, 20:15 Wolfson's [2] - 20:9, 22:25 WONG [1] - 3:12 worded [1] - 10:13 words [1] - 11:9 world [2] - 14:17, 17:11 wrapping [1] - 20:17 written [8] - 4:7, 8:18, 8:19, 8:21, 9:2, 10:4, 10:12, 10:22</p>
<p>U ultimately [1] - 22:2 unambiguous [1] - 10:9 unanimous [1] - 18:9 under [5] - 6:12, 10:19, 15:6, 18:9, 23:15 underlying [1] - 25:12 understood [1] - 22:14 UNITED [2] - 1:1, 1:12 unless [2] - 20:21,</p>	<p>unlike [1] - 6:10 unworkable [1] - 18:9 up [3] - 19:13, 20:17, 21:18 update [1] - 18:25 URQUHART [1] - 1:17 USA [1] - 1:7</p>	<p>V validity [1] - 14:15 various [1] - 4:19 versus [3] - 6:24, 7:19, 13:12 VIA [1] - 4:1 via [1] - 6:20 view [1] - 22:5 violates [1] - 5:1 volume [1] - 24:25</p>	<p>wait [1] - 21:11 WALLACK [1] - 2:8 wants [1] - 22:23 Washington [2] - 3:4, 3:14 washington [1] - 3:10 Watson [1] - 7:21 week [1] - 24:21 Welch [1] - 21:23 WELCH [3] - 3:2, 21:22, 21:25 West [2] - 2:3, 3:7 Westlaw [3] - 6:24, 7:20, 7:22 WILLIAM [1] - 1:14 win [1] - 23:19 WINSTON [1] - 3:12 WITHERS [1] - 2:18 Wolfson [4] - 17:18, 17:22, 17:25, 20:15 Wolfson's [2] - 20:9, 22:25 WONG [1] - 3:12 worded [1] - 10:13 words [1] - 11:9 world [2] - 14:17, 17:11 wrapping [1] - 20:17 written [8] - 4:7, 8:18, 8:19, 8:21, 9:2, 10:4, 10:12, 10:22</p>	<p>X Xactware [1] - 7:19</p>

Y

yesterday [1] - 22:11

York [3] - 1:20, 3:3,
3:10

YOUNGELSON [2] -
2:15, 2:16

Z

Zydus [9] - 2:24, 3:4,
18:1, 21:1, 21:23,
22:3, 22:12, 23:9,
25:13

Zydus's [1] - 23:18